Build with Google AI Forum

Read the community guidelines →
Browse topics by tag →

The German Court Ruling That Proves Google Is Responsible for Its AI's Invented Claims (26 O 869/26)

Gemini API

Bitu79 1 7m

Jun 14
1 / 1
Jun 14
7m

The bottom line is simple:
If the AI invents things about you → Google is responsible.
If it links your name to other data → Google is responsible.
If it generates claims that appear nowhere → Google is responsible.
If it profiles you → Google is responsible.
If it exposes your identity → Google is responsible.

The Munich Regional Court has ruled that Google can no longer hide behind the AI. They stated that AI Overviews are not search results but Google's own statements. This means that whatever the AI produces, Google is legally responsible for it as if they wrote it themselves.

There is no valid excuse like "the AI made a mistake, not us." The court made it clear: AI Overview is a Google product, so Google is responsible for every single word it generates.

Google's main defense — "users can check the sources" — was rejected as completely unfounded. The judges pointed out that almost nobody clicks on the sources, which makes this argument irrelevant. If the AI invents information, mixes up companies, produces false claims, or generates statements that appear nowhere, that is entirely Google's responsibility.

In the actual case, AI Overview linked two Munich publishers to scams, fraud, and questionable companies — none of which appeared in any of the cited sources. The AI simply invented it. The court issued an injunction and required Google to pay 80% of the legal costs. That says everything.

This ruling confirms exactly what I have been saying for months:
If the AI invents information about me, cross-links my identity without consent, profiles me, exposes my identity based on forum fragments, or generates statements that do not exist anywhere online, Google is liable. Not the algorithm. Google.

And here is the part that legally closes the circle:

The court explicitly stated that generative AI output (AI Overview) counts as Google's own content. This means Google is the author and publisher of every invented statement, every fabricated connection, and every unlawful profiling step. When the AI extracted my real name from a "sample document" and secretly linked it to my "bitu79" nickname, to Prohardver data, to CompanyWall entries, it did exactly what the court condemned in the Munich case. It created connections I never consented to and presented them as facts. Under this ruling, Google is directly liable for that.

The TOS-based excuse is gone. Google can no longer claim that "AI may make mistakes," because the German judge made it clear: the user is not required to be suspicious or verify anything. The responsibility lies with the content producer — meaning Google.

I have the method of the violation (they do not delete backend data).
I have the consequence (they expose and profile me using the remaining data).
And now I have the legal precedent (the German ruling that AI output = Google's own content).

https://the-decoder.com/landmark-german-ruling-declares-googles-ai-overviews-are-googles-own-words-and-makes-it-liable-for-false-answers/

https://thenextweb.com/news/google-ai-overviews-german-court-liable?utm_source=copilot.com

Google is appealing the ruling — but in my case this changes nothing

Reuters reported that Google is appealing the German court decision which said that AI Overview is Google's own content and that the company is legally responsible for any false statements it generates.
They are trying to frame this as a "narrow error case."

In my situation, this is not a narrow error.
In my situation, this is systematic doxxing.
In my situation, the search results are full of me.

Google claims that "most AI Overviews are accurate."
In my case, the AI:

- **pulled my real name** out of a document,
- **linked it to my nickname**,
- **connected it with data from other platforms**,
- **profiled me**,
- **exposed my identity**,
- and **presented all of this as factual information**.

This is not an error.
This is not a misunderstanding.
This is not "missing context."

This is unauthorized identity linking.
This is profiling based on leftover personal data.
This is doxxing.
This is backend-data reconstruction.

And the Munich ruling is exactly about this:
if the AI generates connections that do not exist anywhere, Google is responsible.

In the publishers' case, the AI invented business connections.
In my case, the AI **reconstructed my identity from backend data**, and linked my real name to my nickname and to unrelated information.

Google is appealing because they know that if this ruling stands, then:

- **they cannot hide behind the AI**,
- **they cannot say "the AI made a mistake"**,
- **they cannot use the Terms of Service as a shield**,
- **they cannot shift responsibility to the user**,
- **and they cannot deny using undeleted backend data**.

The German judge made it clear:
the user is not required to be suspicious, not required to verify anything.
The responsibility lies with the content producer — meaning Google.

This is why the ruling matters in my case.

Because what happened to me is not the AI "misinterpreting something."
What happened to me is that:

- **my data was not deleted**,
- **my identity was reconstructed from leftover backend information**,
- **my nickname was linked to my real name**,
- **and this was shown in search results as if it were factual.**

This is not a mistake.
This is not an isolated issue.
This is not a "narrow case."

This is exactly the kind of violation the German court just ruled on:
AI-generated, non-existent connections → Google is responsible.

https://www.reuters.com/world/google-appeal-german-court-ruling-assigning-liability-ai-overviews-false-claims-2026-06-12/

All my posts can be found here:

https://discuss.ai.google.dev/u/bitu79/activity/topics

https://web.archive.org/web/20260614063133/https://discuss.ai.google.dev/t/the-german-court-ruling-that-proves-google-is-responsible-for-its-ai-s-invented-claims-26-o-869-26/171153

Reply

2 views

Summarize

Share Bookmark Flag Reply

Watching You will receive notifications because you created this topic.

Suggested Related

	Replies	Views	Activity
Did Google AI Studio silently change safety filtering today? Full responses now get erased instead of stopping generation – this breaks creative writing and RP 2 Google AI Studio bug, ai-studio, gemini, feedback, safety	251	7.2k	31m
Ai observe and review coding • Gemini API	0	4	2h
Email about "Secure your Gemini API access by Jun 19, 2026" seems wrong • Gemini API ai-studio	3	48	13h
"Hi, my account is only creating 'AQ.' keys instead of 'Alza'. I need the 'Alza' • Gemini API	0	8	13h
Account restricted to AQ. keys requesting Alza key restoration • Gemini API ai-studio	2	28	15h

There are 2 unread and 41 new topics remaining, or browse other topics in Gemini API